

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: **Edward Triou, Jr., et al.** Confirmation No.: **7147**

Serial No.: **10/828,947**

Group Art Unit: **2114**

Filing Date: **April 21, 2004**

Examiner: **Paul F. Contino**

For: **SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR AUTOMATED CLASSIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF LARGE VOLUMES OF TEST RESULT DATA**

Mail Stop Appeal-Brief Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

AMENDMENTS TO APPEAL BRIEF

Please amend the Appeal Brief filed February 6, 2008, and further amended March 13, 2008, as required by the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated June 6, 2008, by replacing section 5 as follows. Applicant has also taken this opportunity to correct typographical errors in this section.

5. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Today's software testing produces an enormous number of test results because many software operations are tested in many test scenarios. For example, a software operation may be tested against every operating system environment in which the software may be deployed. As would be expected, many tests produce many test results. Test results can be unwieldy due to the sheer volume. Embodiments of the invention thus provide for automated classification and analysis of large volumes of test result data.

One aspect of the independent claims is that test result data is classified around representative test failures. This notion is present in each of the independent claims as will be apparent from a review of the claims. Independent claims 1 and 7, for example, provide for "linking said list of operating systems to said representative test failure in said database." Independent claim 8 provides "linking an operating system identification from said test result

file to said failure characteristics if said data from a test result file matches said failure characteristics.” Independent claim 22 provides “adding said operating system identifier to a list of operating system identifiers associated with said single failure.”

The notion of classifying test result data around representative test failures is supported in Applicants’ specification, for example, at Fig. 3 and corresponding text at paragraphs 0025 and 0045-0053. Specific support for linking an operating system identification to a representative test failure can be found, for example, at Fig. 0012 and corresponding paragraphs 0054-0059.

The independent claims also recite a variety of elements in addition to those discussed above. These elements are supported in Applicants’ specification at least as follows:

Independent claim 1

1. A method for analyzing test results, comprising: Claim 1 is a method claim.
reading test result data corresponding to at least two test failures; See Fig. 12 (Find matching failure), paragraphs 0040 and 0041, and also Fig. 3 and corresponding text at paragraphs 0025 and 0045-0053 (Collapsing Failures).

wherein a test failure comprises a failed attempt by a software application to conduct an electronic operation on a computer equipped with an operating system; See paragraph 0041 (A first line in the input result file 200 identifies a test that was conducted, “open a file.”), and also Fig. 3, illustrating configurations with various operating systems.

wherein said test result data identifies an operating system associated with each test failure; See Fig. 0012 and corresponding paragraphs 0054-0059. See also failure configurations 401 in Fig. 4 and corresponding list 408 that identifies operating systems (XP, NT5, ME).

determining a representative test failure in said test result data, said representative test failure corresponding to a first failed operation; See Fig. 3 and corresponding text at paragraphs 0025 and 0045-0053.

determining at least one related test failure corresponding to a second failed operation, wherein said second failed operation is a same operation as said first failed operation; See Fig. 3 and corresponding text at paragraphs 0025 and 0045-0053.

parsing said test result data to generate a list of operating systems corresponding to said representative test failure and said at least one related test failure; and See paragraphs

0040 and 0041. See also failure configurations 401 in Fig. 4 and corresponding list 408 that identifies operating systems (XP, NT5, ME).

linking said list of operating systems to said representative test failure in said database. See Fig. 0012 and corresponding paragraphs 0054-0059. See also failure configurations 401 in Fig. 4 and corresponding list 408 that identifies operating systems (XP, NT5, ME).

Independent claim 7

7. A computer readable medium bearing instructions automated test result analysis, comprising: Claim 7 is a computer readable medium claim.

instructions for reading test result data corresponding to at least two test failures; See Fig. 12 (Find matching failure), paragraphs 0040 and 0041, and also Fig. 3 and corresponding text at paragraphs 0025 and 0045-0053 (Collapsing Failures).

wherein a test failure comprises a failed attempt by a software application to conduct an electronic operation on a computer equipped with an operating system; See paragraph 0041 (A first line in the input result file 200 identifies a test that was conducted, “open a file.”), and also Fig. 3, illustrating configurations with various operating systems.

wherein said test result data identifies an operating system associated with each test failure; See Fig. 0012 and corresponding paragraphs 0054-0059. See also failure configurations 401 in Fig. 4 and corresponding list 408 that identifies operating systems (XP, NT5, ME).

instructions for determining a representative test failure in said test result data, said representative test failure corresponding to a first failed operation; See Fig. 3 and corresponding text at paragraphs 0025 and 0045-0053.

instructions for determining at least one related test failure corresponding to a second failed operation, wherein said second failed operation is a same operation as said first failed operation; See Fig. 3 and corresponding text at paragraphs 0025 and 0045-0053.

instructions for parsing said test result data to generate a list of operating systems corresponding to said representative test failure and said at least one related test failure; and See paragraphs 0040 and 0041. See also failure configurations 401 in Fig. 4 and corresponding list 408 that identifies operating systems (XP, NT5, ME).

instructions for linking said list of operating systems to said representative test failure in said database. See Fig. 0012 and corresponding paragraphs 0054-0059. See also failure configurations 401 in Fig. 4 and corresponding list 408 that identifies operating systems (XP, NT5, ME).

Independent claim 8

8. A method for classifying test results, comprising: Claim 8 is a method claim.

extracting data from a test result file, wherein said test result file identifies a failed attempt by a software application to conduct an electronic operation on a computer equipped with an operating system; See failure configurations 401 in Fig. 4 and corresponding list 408 that identifies operating systems (XP, NT5, ME), see also paragraphs 0040 and 0041.

comparing said data to failure characteristics stored in a database; and See Fig. 12 (Search for matching failure characteristics across scenarios), Fig. 3 and corresponding text at paragraphs 0025 and 0045-0053.

linking an operating system identification from said test result file to said failure characteristics if said data from a test result file matches said failure characteristics. See Fig. 0012 and corresponding paragraphs 0054-0059. See also failure configurations 401 in Fig. 4 and corresponding list 408 that identifies operating systems (XP, NT5, ME).

Independent claim 22

22. A method for classifying test results, comprising: Claim 22 is a method claim.

extracting data from a test result file, wherein said test result file identifies a failed attempt by a software application to conduct an electronic operation on a computer equipped with an operating system; See failure configurations 401 in Fig. 4 and corresponding list 408 that identifies operating systems (XP, NT5, ME), see also paragraphs 0040 and 0041.

comparing said data from a test result file to failure characteristics stored in a database, wherein first data that identifies a test operation is used in said comparison and second data that identifies a test scenario comprising at least an operating system identifier is not used in said comparison; and See Fig. 12 (Search for matching failure characteristics across scenarios), Fig. 3 and corresponding text at paragraphs 0025 and 0045-0053.

if a match is discovered from said comparing, identifying said data from a test result file and said failure characteristics as a single failure in a Graphical User Interface (GUI),

and adding said operating system identifier to a list of operating system identifiers associated with said single failure. See Failure Viewer Tree 1118 in the box labeled “GUI” in Fig. 11. See Fig. 0012 and corresponding paragraphs 0054-0059. See also failure configurations 401 in Fig. 4 and corresponding list 408 that identifies operating systems (XP, NT5, ME).

Date: June 23, 2008

/Michael J. Swope/
Michael J. Swope
Registration No. 38,041

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439